

*Journal
of
Vaiṣṇava
Studies*

Focus on: HAGIOGRAPHY

FRANCIS X. CLOONEY, S.J.

*In Search of Nammālvār:
Reflections on the Meeting Point
of Traditional and Contemporary Scholarship*

DENNIS HUDSON

Āṅṅālvār: A Developing Hagiography

JOHN STRATTON HAWLEY

Why Śrīdās Went Blind

PHILIP LUTGENDORF

The Quest for the Legendary Tulsīdās

JOSEPH T. O'CONNELL

Historicity in the Biographies of Caitanya

NEAL DELMONICO

*Rūpa Gosvāmin:
His Life, Family and Early Vraja Commentators*

MICHAEL WRIGHT and NANCY WRIGHT
Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa: The Gauḍīya Vedāntist

Journal of Vaiṣṇava Studies

Publisher & Editor-in-Chief
Steven J. Rosen

Senior Editor
Paul H. Sherbow

Associate Editors
Eric Huberman
Bruce N. Scharf
D. Bryant Smith
Nancy Terry

Design/Production
Barbara Berasi

**International
Advisory Board**
Guy L. Beck

(Louisiana State University)

Gerald T. Carney
(Hampden-Sydney College, Virginia)

Amarnath Chatterjee
(Shaheed Bhagat Singh College,
University of Delhi)

Rahul Peter Das
(Universität Hamburg)

Gavin D. Flood
(St. David's University College,
University of Wales)

Mohan K. Gautam
(University of Leiden)

Nirmal Narayan Gupta
(Bengali Educational Facility,
Howrah, Calcutta)

Thomas J. Hopkins
(Franklin & Marshall College,
Pennsylvania)

June McDaniel
(College of Charleston)

Joseph T. O'Connell
(St. Michael's College,
University of Toronto)

William S. Sax
(University of Canterbury,
Christchurch)

Journal of Vaiṣṇava Studies (ISSN 1062-1237) is published four times a year, in November, February, May, and August, by FOLK Books, P.O. Box 400716, Brooklyn, New York 11240-0716. Fax: 1-718-852-9109. Manuscripts, subscriptions (payable to FOLK Books), advertising, books for mention and related correspondence should be sent to the Editor-in-chief at the above address.

An article for consideration should be written in English. If the original is in Sanskrit, Hindi, Bengali, or other languages, the author will be responsible for the English translation. Diacritics and transliteration techniques are left to the discretion of individual authors. Therefore, words such as Krishna (or Kṛṣṇa) and Braj (or Vraja) will be used variously, without attempting consistency.

Manuscripts should be typed, with footnotes, and should be double-spaced. Priority will be given to contributions submitted on floppy disks and written in Microsoft Word. The journal is thematic, and contributors who want a list of issue themes for the forthcoming year should write to the journal specifically requesting this list.

Subscription rates: U.S.A., one year: \$35.00. Single issue: \$10.95; Outside of U.S.A., add \$5.00 per issue both for quarterly subscription and single issues.

Statement of Purpose: *Journal of Vaiṣṇava Studies* (JVS) is a quarterly, interdisciplinary publication dedicated to the in-depth study of the Vaiṣṇava traditions of India, from ancient times to the present. The journal highlights the research of Vaiṣṇava scholars and scholars of Vaiṣṇavism, thus representing both practitioner and academic points of view. JVS is a refereed journal, all entries being reviewed by acknowledged experts prior to publication. Opinions expressed in authored articles do not necessarily represent the views of the editors. The copyright of all printed material in JVS rests with JVS and the authors, and written permission is needed if one wishes to copy this material in any form and for any purpose. © FOLK Books 1993

JOURNAL OF VAIṢṆAVA STUDIES

Volume 1 No. 2 Winter 1993

Introduction	i
Correspondence	1
Francis X. Clooney, S.J. /In Search of Nammālvār: Reflections on the Meeting Point of Traditional and Contemporary Scholarship	8
Dennis Hudson/Āṅṅāḷ Ālvār: A Developing Hagiography	27
John Stratton Hawley/Why Sūrdās Went Blind	62
Philip Lutgendorf/The Quest for the Legendary Tulsidās	79
Joseph T. O'Connell/Historicity in the Biographies of Caitanya	102
Neal Delmonico/Rūpa Gosvāmin: His Life, Family and Early Vraja Commentators	133
Michael Wright and Nancy Wright/Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa: The Gauḍīya Vedāntist	158
Book Reviews	185
About the Contributors	189
Errata	191

cation of spirit, is nothing but spirit itself, for all is one. . . ." *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* takes every opportunity to refute this point of view, and it does so with clarity and thoroughness.

⁵⁰ *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* 1.14.27-32. Translations of this and other passages from the biographies are mine.

RŪPA GOŚVĀMIN: HIS LIFE, FAMILY, AND EARLY VRAJA COMMENTATORS

Neal Delmonico

Since few reliable discussions of the lives of Rūpa Gosvāmin and his brother Sanātana Gosvāmin are available in English, a brief account, based on the most recent research both in English and in Indic languages, seems a useful addition to the discussion of hagiography in the Vaiṣṇava tradition. The primary focus of this study will be Rūpa and his thought; nevertheless, his elder brother, Sanātana, cannot be overlooked, because of Sanātana's close association with and influence upon Rūpa.¹ In any event to try to do so would be impossible, since the histories of Rūpa and Sanātana are so intimately intertwined that to tell the story of one requires telling that of the other. These two disciples of Caitanya formed the hub around which the Vṛndāvana circle of his followers revolved. Next in importance is certainly their nephew, Jīva Gosvāmin, who became the leader of the Vṛndāvana circle after the deaths of his uncles and who was one of the Caitanya tradition's most gifted philosopher/theologians. Since all three exceptional men came from one family, they can easily be treated as a single group.

The lives of Sanātana and Rūpa were quite unusual and dramatic, and because of the important roles they played in establishing a strong textual tradition for Caitanya Vaiṣṇavism, a good deal of information about them has been recorded in the most influential biography of Caitanya, the *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* of Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja. In addition, Jīva has recorded their family's genealogy and history and provided a list of their works at the end of his *Laghu-vaiṣṇava-koṣaṇī*, a commentary on the Tenth Canto of the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*.² A later work (mid-eighteenth century), the *Bhakti-ratnākara* by Narahari Cakravartin, supplies some added details. With the help of all of these texts one can compose a fairly complete picture of some aspects of their lives.

Sanātana and Rūpa were descendants of a respected family of *brāh-* ?
maṇas who were part of the royalty of Kārṇāṭaka. Their earliest known ancestor was Sarvajña Jagatguru (see Appendix) who was a lord of the

Appendix: *caritāmṛta* part
then mentioned by
Jīva, I guess.

visveśvara? - see APP.

country of Karṇāṭaka and a member of the ancient Bharadvāja *gotra* (lineage). He was reputed to have known and recited the three Vedas. If one allows twenty-five years for each of the brothers' six preceding generations, then he was born in approximately the first quarter of the fourteenth century.³ His son was Aniruddha who also ruled as a king and was a lord of other kings. He knew the entire Yajur Veda. Aniruddha had two sons, Rūpeśvara and Harihara, who had very different characters. Rūpeśvara excelled in scriptural learning (*śāstra*) and Harihara in the art of weaponry (*śāstra*). Though Aniruddha divided his realm for his two sons on his death bed, after his death the younger son, Harihara, expelled his elder brother from his rightful inheritance. Rūpeśvara, therefore, was forced to leave his ancestral home with his wife and eight horses. He settled in a land to the east which was ruled by a friend of his who is referred to as the lord of the peaks (*Śikharēśvara*) and lived happily there. A son was soon born to him by the name of Padmanābha. Padmanābha was a great devotee of Jagannātha and, continuing the family tradition, was learned in the Yajur Veda. The mention of Jagannātha in this connection leads one to the speculation that the land to which Rūpeśvara fled may have been in or around Kaliṅga, modern Orissa. The ruler of that land may have been known as the lord of peaks not because of any mountains, though the Eastern Ghats run through parts of Andhra and Orissa, but because of the temple architecture, which stylistically represents mountain peaks, characteristic of that area. Interestingly, one of Puri's ancient names is Nilācala, "Blue Mountain."

Padmanābha moved away from the Land of Peaks out of a desire to live near the Gaṅgā and thus settled in Navahaṭṭaka (said to be modern day Naihāṭi, north of Calcutta in the district of 24 Parganas) in the kingdom of Danujamārdana. There is evidence of a king named Danujamārdana Deva who ruled in Pāṇḍuā, a town that was south of Navadvīpa and north of Saptagrāma, and existed in the fifteenth century, around 1417-18 A.D.⁴ Padmanābha created a huge family (eighteen daughters and five sons) the youngest son of which was named Mukunda. Mukunda's son was Kumāra who because of some treachery within the family moved to East Bengal. Kumāra according to the account of the *Bhakti-ratnākara* was extremely devoted to the ritual duties of a *brāhmaṇa* and was very careful about maintaining his ritual purity. If he even saw a non-Hindu he would perform atonements and fasting.

He moved to a village called Bāklā Candradvīpa in the southern part of East Bengal and apparently maintained another house in Fatehābāda in the Jessore District for convenience in frequent traveling. Among his sons were Sanātana, Rūpa, and Vallabha, the father of Jīva.⁵

Sanātana and Rūpa were born in either Candradvīpa or Fatehābāda. The dates of their births are uncertain. One set of opinions groups their birth dates between 1488 and 1492 A.D. (Sanātana in 1488 and Rūpa in 1489 or 1490).⁶ Another more reasonable account places Sanātana's birth in 1465 and Rūpa's in 1470. According to this account, if Sanātana and Rūpa were born at the end of the 1480s they would have only been in their twenties at the time of their meeting with Caitanya in 1514-15. It is unlikely that at such young ages they would have already achieved such respected positions as private secretaries of the Nawāb Husain Shāh.⁷ Also, if Rūpa's play, the *Dāna-keli-kaumudī* was actually written in 1495 as S.K. De claims, Rūpa would have written it at the age of five!⁸ For these and other reasons the earlier dates for Sanātana and Rūpa are the most plausible. One other opinion is noteworthy, however. It places their dates in between these two extremes, settling on 1482 and 1484 as the dates of their births. This is based on the supposition that Rūpa was thirty years old when he met Caitanya at Rāmakeli in 1514.⁹

Not much is known of their early lives or educations. Sanātana, however, gives an interesting list of his teachers at the beginning of his final work, the commentary on the Tenth Canto of the *Bhāgavata Purāna* called *Vaiṣṇava-toṣaṇī*. He offers his respect to Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya, to a Vidyāvācaspati, to a Vidyābhūṣaṇa, to a Paramānanda Bhaṭṭācārya who loves *rasa*, to a Rāmabhadra and to a Vāṇi-vilāsa.¹⁰ Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya was apparently the famous logician of Navadvīpa who later became a disciple of Caitanya. Vidyāvācaspati probably refers to Sārvabhauma's younger brother whose full name was Viṣṇudāsa Bhaṭṭācārya.¹¹ The honorific plural given to his name in Sanātana's verse indicates that Viṣṇudāsa was Sanātana's primary teacher. Who the others mentioned in the verse were is not certain. Some scholars think that the Paramānanda Bhaṭṭācārya mentioned in the verse as a lover of *rasa* is Paramānanda Cakravartin who was the earliest known Bengali commentator of the *Kāvya-prakāśa*.¹² Paramānanda Cakravartin identifies his teacher as Iśāna Nyāyācārya who was a senior contemporary of

Why such a point of view?

the famous Bengali neo-logician, Raghunātha Śiromaṇi. Iśāna's birth occurred in the first quarter of the fifteenth century¹³ placing Paramānanda's birth sometime in the second quarter of the fifteenth century. This, indeed, places him in the right period to have been Sanātana's teacher. There was, however, a Paramānanda Bhaṭṭācārya who lived in Vṛndāvana at the same time as Sanātana, according to the *Bhakti-ratnākara*.¹⁴ He was a close friend of Madhupaṇḍita and bestowed the service of the Gopinātha deity on him. The possibility that this is the Paramānanda to whom Sanātana refers cannot be overlooked. The idea that Rūpa and Sanātana studied Nyāya is supported by the *Bhakti-ratnākara*, which says that Sanātana and Rūpa were renowned scholars of Nyāya to whom writers on this topic brought their manuscripts for criticism.¹⁵ It appears then that Sanātana studied Nyāya (logic) and Alaṅkāra (literary criticism), at the very least. (There is a commentary on Kālidāsa's *Meghadūta* that is apparently by Sanātana. It is included in the edition of the text published by the Prācyā Vāṇī Maṇḍira grantha-mālā in the 1950s.) The subjects that he studied from the other teachers mentioned in the verse are unknown. Rūpa, who was a few years younger than Sanātana, may have also studied with some of these men, but it cannot be said for certain. More importantly, the *Bhakti-ratnākara* says that Sanātana and Rūpa, during their government service, encouraged a community of Karṇāṭaka *brāhmaṇas* to settle on the bank of the Gaṅgā near them in a village called Bhaṭṭabāṇī.¹⁶ It is certain that they studied some subjects with members of this community as well.¹⁷

At some point, Sanātana and Rūpa moved to Rāmakeli near Gauḍa, the Muslim capital of Bengal, and became employed as secretaries of the Nawāb Husain Shāh. Various stories are told about how they became employed in the service of the Muslim ruler. The most likely suggestion is found in the *Bhakti-ratnākara* which says that the brothers were widely known as learned and wise men and were recommended to the Shāh as intelligent and reliable assistants. This text also suggests that they may have been forced into the service of the Nawāb against their wills, perhaps under threat of caste pollution (a threat that was actually carried out in the case of a friend of theirs, Subuddhi Rāya).¹⁸ Some (Dimock, et al) suggest that they had converted to Islam, while others (Jānā, et al) argue that they never really converted nor were forced to convert to Islam.¹⁹ Jānā claims that the Muslim names that are associated with them, Sākara Mallika (Sanātana) and Dabira Khāsa

(Rūpa), were actually, in the first case, an address of respect and in the second the title of a particular functionary in the Muslim government. *sākara mallika* means "respected sir" and *dabira khāsa* means "private secretary,"²⁰ a position that the brothers apparently both held because both are called *dabira khāsa* in some texts.²¹ It is difficult to decide conclusively on which was the case. If the brothers had converted to Islam it is unlikely that they could have attracted a community of Karṇāṭaka *brāhmaṇas* to settle near them, as they apparently did. On the other hand, their statements about the lowness of their caste and occupations as they are represented in the *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* may be interpreted as admissions of conversions, or, they may be taken as merely reflections of their humility and awareness of the precarious nature of their positions.²²

Though the brothers seem to have been paid well for their services, they were apparently unhappy with their positions and wrote to Caitanya asking his help.²³ They finally met with him in 1514 at Rāmakeli when he made his first attempt to visit Vṛndāvana. They both subsequently decided to leave the service of the Nawāb and made secret arrangements to dispose of all their property. Rūpa and his younger brother Vallabha, who was also in the service of the Nawāb in some capacity, slipped away with their property under the cover of night. Sanātana remained at Rāmakeli but stopped attending to his government work, claiming illness. Instead, he stayed at home and began to study the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* seriously in the company of twenty or thirty *brāhmaṇas*. The Nawāb paid him a surprise visit and had him arrested fearing that he too would run off as Rūpa had. Eventually, Sanātana managed to buy his freedom and travel to Vārāṇasī incognito where he met Caitanya and stayed with him for two months. Caitanya had met with Rūpa earlier at Prayāga and sent him on to Vṛndāvana after instructing him in *bhakti*. After instructing Sanātana for two months, Caitanya also sent him to Vṛndāvana. He asked both Rūpa and Sanātana to identify and excavate the sacred sites of Vṛndāvana and to write books on the worship of Kṛṣṇa. In Vṛndāvana, they were out of reach of the Nawāb of Bengal. Had the former private secretaries of the Nawāb settled in Purī, the capital of the Nawāb's chief adversary, the Hindu king of Orissa, Pratāparudra, their lives would have been seriously endangered and the political repercussions would certainly have been even more serious.

The brothers settled in Vṛndāvana in around 1516 or 1517 A.D. and lived there for the rest of their lives writing works on the Vaiṣṇava faith and rediscovering the sacred sites of Kṛṣṇa's activities. For a short period of around ten months, each of them visited their mentor in Purī for instruction and inspiration. During their days in Vṛndāvana, they each established the worship of an image of Kṛṣṇa and eventually, after their deaths, temples were built to house these images. Sanātana established the worship of an image of Kṛṣṇa called Madanamohana and Rūpa the worship of Govinda.

The exact dates of their deaths are not known. One line of reasoning places Sanātana's death in 1554 or 1555. This is based on a verse in Jīva's *Mādhava-mahotsava* which appears to refer to the death of Sanātana.²⁴ This poem was written in 1555. As Sanātana's final work, the *Vaiṣṇava-toṣaṇī*, is dated 1554, he is thought to have died between 1554 and 1555. Rūpa is said to have died a year or two afterwards. Sukhamaya Mukhopādhyāya has criticized this line of reasoning as a misreading of Jīva's verse, however, and argues that Sanātana and Rūpa died just before the arrival of Śrīnivāsa in Vṛndāvana in 1562. He therefore gives their final dates as 1560 and 1561.²⁵

The literary works of these two brothers, especially those of Rūpa, are numerous and quite extraordinary. Sanātana's major works were the *Bṛhad-bhāgavatāmṛta*, a mythopoeic story in the style of a Purāṇa, and the *Vaiṣṇava-toṣaṇī*, a detailed exegetical commentary on the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*. Rūpa's works include several plays and poems and two major works on sacred aesthetics, the *Bhakti-rasāmṛta-sindhu* and the *Ujvala-nīlamanī*. The *Ujvala-nīlamanī* may have been the last of Rūpa's major works and could possibly have been written when he was in his eighties. Though Rūpa's works gained a special position of authority and respect in the Caitanya tradition, Rūpa's debt to Sanātana, something to which he himself repeatedly attests, cannot be overestimated.

From this brief review of the lives of Sanātana and Rūpa a number of observations, the relevance of which will become more apparent later, can be made. The brothers were first of all descendants of a high class and influential Karnāṭaka *brāhmaṇa* family and managed even during their period of service in the government of Husain Shāh to maintain close connections with that community and through it their southern cultural heritage. Nevertheless, they regarded themselves as outcastes,

beyond the pale of proper Hindu society, because of their relationship to the Muslim leader. Secondly, their relationship with the Muslim ruler of Bengal seems to have been an ambiguous one. Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja portrays a relationship of affection between the ruler and his secretaries.²⁶ Yet, in order to leave the service of the Nawāb, they had to escape from his reach, something which they successfully did by fleeing to Vṛndāvana. As a result of their experience in the court of Gauḍa, however, they were familiar with the workings of the Muslim courts and knew how to deal with the political realities of northern India in the sixteenth century. Thirdly, both men were extraordinarily well educated and equipped for the tasks that Caitanya gave them. They managed to collect together a close and talented circle of Vaiṣṇavas in the Mathurā area and provided the needed scriptural, literary and theological bases for the new, eccentric religious experiences and inclinations of their leader and the movement he inspired. The insights that these two men expressed in their works became the major ideals that the later Caitanya tradition pursued. They captured an important "aesthetic" impulse inherent in the movement that remained one of the later tradition's most distinctive and vibrant forces.

The nephew of Rūpa and Sanātana was Jīva Gosvāmin, who contributed to another important impulse in the Caitanya Vaiṣṇava tradition, one that provided it with a necessary stability and structure which his uncles were unable to bestow. Among Jīva's first acts on his arrival in Vraja were purchases of parcels of land. Old Persian documents recovered from the sect's most sacred of sites, Rādhā-kuṇḍa near Govardhana, record the history of these early transactions which began in 1546 A.D. Gradually, through a series of purchases, Jīva acquired all of the property surrounding Rādhā-kuṇḍa and Śyāma-kuṇḍa on behalf of Raghunāthadāsa Gosvāmin.²⁷ This acquisitive endeavor culminated in Jīva's dedication of the Govinda temple in 1590 on the spot discovered by his uncle Rūpa that was recognized as the sacred center of the Vraja area (the vicinity believed to be the site of Kṛṣṇa's childhood days).²⁸ The multi-storied, massive temple that was built with the financial help of King Mānasimha of Rājasthān required an enormous amount of diplomacy and organization for its completion. The eternal flame which burned from the spire, after all, could be seen easily from the royal highway between Agra and Delhi which was the regular route of the conquering Muslim army and sometimes could be seen all the way from the imperial capital, Agra itself.²⁹

Jiva is primarily remembered as the greatest theologian of the Caitanya tradition. Though he also wrote poetry (*Mādhava-mahotsava*, *Gopāla-campū*, *Sankalpa-kalpadruma*, etc.), his major work is the *Ṣaṭ-sandarbha*. Though this latter work may be seen as a reshaping of an earlier version of the same text compiled by Gopāla Bhaṭṭa, Jiva ordered it in a more logical fashion and expanded it to cover all the major philosophical concerns of the Caitanya tradition.³⁰ His importance for the study of sacred aesthetics lies primarily in his commentaries on the *Bhakti-rasāmṛta-sindhu* and the *Ujjvala-nīlamanī*, which were the earliest and most influential of each text's three extant commentaries and in the strong position he took in those commentaries for the *svakīya* ("marital") interpretation of the relationship between Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa. His commentary on the *Ujjvala-nīlamanī*, called the *Locana-rocanī*, is an invaluable document for understanding Rūpa's difficult text.

The exact year of Jiva's birth is, as in other cases, uncertain. The *Bhakti-ratnākara* says that as a small child of four or five years old he saw Caitanya from hiding during Caitanya's visit to Rāmakeli in 1514.³¹ His father, the younger brother of Rūpa and Sanātana, had two names, Anupama and Vallabha. Not many details of his life are known. It is known that he died on a journey with Rūpa from Vṛndāvana to Gauḍa in around 1516. Therefore, the range of possible dates for Jiva's birth is 1510 to 1517.³²

After his uncles left the service of the Shāh and after the death of his father, Jiva lived with his mother in either Bāklā Candradvīpa or Fatehābāda. As a student Jiva was reportedly brilliant. At a young age he mastered grammar and the other standard disciplines.³³ He left his home as a young man to join his uncles in Vraja and on his way he stopped in Navadvīpa where, according to the *Bhakti-ratnākara*, he met Nityānanda, Caitanya's close associate and assistant.³⁴ After receiving his blessings, Jiva went on to Vārāṇasī where he studied Vedānta under a teacher named Madhusūdana Vācaspatī (not to be confused with Madhusūdana Sarasvatī the great Advaita Vedāntin who was born in 1540).³⁵ He arrived in Vraja either before 1541 or before 1545. In support of the first date, the *Bhakti-ratnākara* says that when Rūpa was writing the *Bhakti-rasāmṛta-sindhu*, which was completed in 1541, he asked Jiva to look at it critically.³⁶ Whether the *Bhakti-ratnākara* is correct or not on this matter, Jiva was certainly in Vṛndāvana by 1546, for his name appears on the deeds of Rādhā-kunḍa, the first of which is dated 1546.³⁷

Jiva was an important figure in the Caitanya tradition for several reasons. Not only did he write books and buy land, he also was responsible for training some of the most powerful exponents of the Caitanya tradition and, through them, spreading the writings of his uncles in Bengal. Jiva taught three talented young men who later returned to their homelands and created a literary and religious revolution in Bengal and Orissa that lasted through the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. These three men were Śrīnivāsācārya, Narottamadāsa Ṭhākura and Śyāmānandadāsa. Śrīnivāsa converted the king of Viṣṇupura to Caitanya Vaiṣṇavism and thereby created a stronghold for the tradition in that kingdom (modern Bankura District). Narottamadāsa spread Caitanya Vaiṣṇavism in East Bengal, primarily by means of his numerous Bengali songs. Śyāmānanda carried the theology of the Vṛndāvana Gosvāmins to Orissa and established a strong tradition there. The members of the disciplic lines established by these men account for a large part of the prolific vernacular literature that grew up in the following centuries.

Apparently the belongings and libraries of his uncles came into Jiva's possession after their deaths and with them the enormous responsibility of continuing the tradition which his uncles helped foster. He became one of the leaders of the Vṛndāvana circle in the second half of the sixteenth century. A last will and testament has recently been published proving that Jiva was still alive in 1608, though he was then, perhaps, on his death bed. In this will he passed on the service of his images, his lands, and books to a Śrī Vilāsadāsa or, in case he wished to relinquish his rights, to Kṛṣṇadāsa, the son of Bhārātācārya. Some of the leading figures of the Vṛndāvana circle affixed their signatures to that document as witnesses: Gadādhara Bhaṭṭa, Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja, Rāghunātha Purohita (Paṇḍita?), Haridāsa (Paṇḍita?) and others.³⁸ It therefore appears that Jiva died in 1608 or 1609.

Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja, whose signature appears on the above mentioned document, was one of the central figures in the second generation of the Caitanya tradition. The first generation consisted of Caitanya and his close associates, among whom I include Rūpa and Sanātana. The second generation consisted of those who never actually met Caitanya directly, but who picked up and carried on the tradition under the influence of one of his associates. Jiva Gosvāmin occupied a somewhat unique position in the tradition because he fell between the generations. He, as a child, apparently saw Caitanya, but never spent any

length of time with him. He also met Nityānanda on his way to Vṛndāvana. In spite of this he will be included in the second generation within which he was undoubtedly the foremost member of the Vṛndāvana community. Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja, however, was in many ways as influential if not more so than Jīva because he made the textual tradition of the Gosvāmins available to the common follower of the Caitanya faith. Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja's major work was the *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* which not only provided the most striking and powerful interpretation of the life of Caitanya, the one which struck the deepest chord in the minds of Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja's contemporaries, but also made many of the most important teachings of the difficult works of Rūpa and Sanātana available in Bengali. Thus, his work constitutes an early vernacular commentary and interpretation of Rūpa's *Ujjuvala-nīlamanī* and its sister text the *Bhakti-rasāmṛta-sindhu*, and of Sanātana's *Hari-bhakti-vilāsa* as well.

D.C. Sen and Rādhāgovinda Nātha disagree on Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja's birth date. Sen gives the year 1517 as the year of his birth and Rādhāgovinda Nātha says 1528.³⁹ Though neither is founded on any substantial evidence, the later date is more probable since Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja did not have an opportunity to meet either Caitanya or Nityānanda (who died sometime between the years 1540 and 1545).⁴⁰ Had he been born in 1517 it is reasonable to assume that such a devoted follower of Caitanya would have made some attempt to see him or Nityānanda personally. Tradition has it that Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja was born in the village of Jhamatpura in the district of Vardhamāna. His father was Bhagīratha, his mother Sunandā and he had a younger brother named Śyāmadāsa. His father was a Vaidya, an Āyurvedic doctor, who had difficulty providing for his family. When he was still young Kṛṣṇadāsa's parents died and he and his brother were raised by his father's childless sister.⁴¹

Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja tells us of a disagreement he had with his brother over the status of Nityānanda. This disagreement was sparked by Śyāmadāsa's showing disrespect to one of Nityānanda's disciples, Mīnaketana Rāmadāsa, during a *kīrtana* performance.⁴² Kṛṣṇadāsa became extremely upset with his brother and chastised him. Nityānanda appeared to Kṛṣṇadāsa in a dream that night and instructed him to go to Vṛndāvana. He left the next day and, once arriving in Vraja, he decided to live there for the rest of his life. If he left home at the age of twenty-six, as one opinion has it,⁴³ he would have arrived in Vṛndāvana in 1554 or 1555.⁴⁴ B.B. Majumdar argues that if Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja arrived in Vṛn-

dāvana in the middle or late 1550s, he may have arrived after the death of Sanātana (and at the very end of Rūpa's life). If so, this may account for the mysterious way in which he fails to mention Sanātana Gosvāmin in the dedicatory colophons with which each of the chapters of his Sanskrit poem, the *Govinda-līlāmṛta*, ends.⁴⁵ Sukhamaya Mukhopādhyāya argues, however, that Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja in his *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* tells us that he knew Sanātana and Rūpa directly.⁴⁶ Furthermore, Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja is mentioned by Raghunāthadāsa Gosvāmin at the end of his *Muktā-carita*, which, since it is quoted in the *Ujjuvala-nīlamanī*, must have been written before 1554.⁴⁷ Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja must have arrived in Vṛndāvana earlier than 1554, perhaps at the end of the 1540s, and have already established a close friendship (and maybe discipleship) with Raghunāthadāsa Gosvāmin.

There is some doubt about who Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja's initiating guru was. Rādhāgovinda Nātha asserts that Raghunātha Bhaṭṭa Gosvāmin was his *mantra-guru*. In addition to several textual references he cites as evidence the *praṇālī* (succession) of gurus handed down in the "Kavirāja family" of the Caitanya tradition which lists Raghunātha Bhaṭṭa as the guru of Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja.⁴⁸ Ravindranātha Maiti argues on the basis of the dubious authority of the *Prema-vilāsa* and certain other textual references that Raghunāthadāsa was the *mantra-guru* of Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja.⁴⁹ Raghunāthadāsa's mention of Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja at the end of his *Muktā-carita*, however, has a tone of praise more suitable for a cherished friend and close companion than for a disciple.⁵⁰ It is well known that Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja and Raghunāthadāsa were close companions and that they lived together at Rādhā-kuṇḍa. As an indication of their closeness the Govardhana *śilā* (stone) which was given to Raghunāthadāsa for worship by Caitanya himself was passed on to Kṛṣṇadāsa after Raghunātha's death. But this does not necessarily indicate that Kṛṣṇadāsa was Raghunātha's disciple.⁵¹

The Govardhana *śilā* was not all that was passed on to Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja. He also received the entire lore of Caitanya's last days at Purī which Raghunāthadāsa, who was then in the tutelage of Svarūpa Dāmodara, had himself witnessed. Kṛṣṇadāsa may have also had an opportunity to meet Svarūpa Dāmodara and learn from him personally about Caitanya's last days.⁵² This would have made him the greatest authority on the final days of Caitanya and on the esoteric interpretation of Caitanya's mission and divinity which grew up in the inner circle of Cai-

tanya's associates at Puri. For this reason, Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja was asked by representatives of the third generation of the Caitanya tradition at Vṛndāvana to record this interpretation of the life of Caitanya, a request which he honored by writing the *Caitanya-caritāmṛta*.⁵³

Kṛṣṇadāsa wrote one other major work, a twenty-three-chapter, 2,588-verse, Sanskrit poem called the *Govinda-līlāmṛta*, which, as B.B. Majumdar says, may be the largest versified poem on the activities of Govinda ever written.⁵⁴ The *Govinda-līlāmṛta* is an extraordinary work which fosters the practice of meditation on the daily cycle of Kṛṣṇa's activities which are divided into eight distinct periods. The work shows the vast learning of the author and his skill as a composer of Sanskrit verse. It is believed to have been written on the instructions and guidelines given by Rūpa Gosvāmin when he was on his death bed and has become the basis of the meditation and visualization practices that have become important parts of the Caitanya tradition.⁵⁵ B.B. Majumdar has suggested that Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja received the title "Kavirāja (King of Poets)" because of the composition of the *Govinda-līlāmṛta*.⁵⁶ It is more likely, however, that he was known as Kavirāja because of his family background (Āyurvedic doctors are called "Kavirājas" in Bengal) and occupation as a doctor before leaving home. In support of this one might point again to Raghunāthadāsa's reference to him as *kavi-bhū-pati* (king of poets) at the end of his *Muktā-carita* which, being written before the *Ujjvala-nīlamanī*, was also written long before the *Govinda-līlāmṛta*.⁵⁷

There is a wide diversion of opinion on the date of Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja's death. The date of his death is intimately connected with the date of the completion of the *Caitanya-caritāmṛta*, because by his own admission he was quite old and close to death when he finished it.⁵⁸ The colophon of the *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* has some variant readings and interpretations. One reading identifies the date of the *Caitanya-caritāmṛta*'s completion as 1581.⁵⁹ This date is supported by the *Prema-vilāsa*, supposedly completed in 1600, which cites the version of the colophon of the *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* that gives the 1581 date.⁶⁰ Another text, the *Karṇānanda* by Yadunandana, which was completed in 1607, quotes from the *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* thereby adding more support for this early date.⁶¹ This date is tied to a story about the way in which Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja died as told in both the *Prema-vilāsa* and the *Karṇānanda*. According to those versions, when Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja finished his *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* in 1581 it was sent to Bengal with the original manuscripts

of all the other works of the Gosvāmins in the company of Śrīnivās-ācārya and Narottamadāsa. During this journey the manuscripts were stolen by the men of the King of Viṣṇupura, Vira Hamvira, who thought that the chests filled with manuscripts contained treasure instead. When the news of the loss reached Vṛndāvana by letter, Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja became so upset and despondent that he jumped into the pond called Rādhā-kuṇḍa and drowned. Thus a somewhat cogent, traditional chronology emerges.⁶²

More recent discoveries have shown that these dates and stories cannot be factual. Most manuscripts and printed editions of the *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* have another version of the colophon which puts the date of its completion in 1615 or, by another possible interpretation, in 1612.⁶³ In addition, the *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* quotes a text of Jīva's, the *Gopāla-campū*, the second half of which was not completed until 1592. Also, the last will and testament of Jīva, which was witnessed by Kṛṣṇadāsa, proves that he was alive in 1608.⁶⁴ Furthermore, when Kṛṣṇadāsa lists the prominent Vaiṣṇavas of Vṛndāvana who requested that he write the *Caitanya-caritāmṛta*, Jīva's name is not mentioned.⁶⁵ It is therefore likely that the *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* was started after Jīva's death, around 1610 or 1611, and completed in 1615. This new evidence falsifies the apocryphal stories such as that of the death of Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja and that of the disagreement between Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja and Jīva over the writing of the *Caitanya-caritāmṛta*.⁶⁶ Instead, there was apparently a good relationship between Kṛṣṇadāsa and Jīva until 1608 and it is likely that Jīva never knew of the *Caitanya-caritāmṛta*, that is to say, it was compiled after his time.

Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja had four disciples that we know of, but only two of them are important for a study of Rūpa's thought, since only two of them commented on Rūpa's work. According to a manuscript purporting to be a description of the branches of Kṛṣṇadāsa's initiation lineage, one of his disciples was Viṣṇudāsa Gosvāmin.⁶⁷ This is the Viṣṇudāsa who wrote the commentary on the *Ujjvala-nīlamanī* called the *Svātmā-pramodīnī*.⁶⁸ Though the commentary does not explicitly mention Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja, in the closing verses, Viṣṇudāsa praises a Kavirāja as his *guru* and prays that his commentary will be a repeated pleasure for him to listen to.⁶⁹ Thus, the commentary was apparently written at a time when Kṛṣṇadāsa was still alive. In the opening verses of his commentary, Viṣṇudāsa also praises his *guru* and extols the power he granted him for

composing verse.⁷⁰ Viṣṇudāsa was therefore the author of some other poetic work or works and may well be the author of a messenger poem called *Manodūta*.⁷¹ His commentary on the *Ujjvala-nīlamanī* reveals that he was extraordinarily well read and was familiar not only with the great, pan-Indian works of Kṛṣṇa poetry, but also with some of the important mainstream texts on literary criticism (the *Kāvya-pradīpa* of Govinda Ṭhākura, for instance). He quotes liberally from these other works in providing examples in support of the statements of the *Ujjvala-nīlamanī*. Not much else is known about Viṣṇudāsa, unfortunately.

The other disciple of Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja who is important for a study of Rūpa's thought is Mukundadāsa Gosvāmin. The story of Mukundadāsa and his disciple Rūpa Kavirāja is quite interesting, as is the role they played in the development of the later tradition. Unfortunately, these matters will have to be considered at some other time. What can be mentioned here, however, is that Mukundadāsa wrote an important commentary on Rūpa Gosvāmin's *Bhakti-rasāmṛta-sindhu*, entitled *Artharatnāḷpa-dīpikā*.

This concludes a brief and somewhat sketchy treatment of the lives of Rūpa and Sanātana along with the lives of some of their major followers and interpreters. An effort has been made to use original texts as well as the most recent scholarly materials in framing this discussion. Obviously, much more work needs to be done on the history of this fascinating period of Caitanya Vaiṣṇavism. This period is the one in which the popular movement was becoming a tradition, the intensity of religious passion and experience was being turned into the institutions that withstood the winds of time and the scorching heat of scrutiny by other competing religious sects. These writers were the writers that helped bring about that successful transformation. Hopefully, the suggested outlines of the lives of these great Vaiṣṇava authors in the preceding discussion will help others to comprehend not only their works but the impact of their works on the emerging tradition, and, perhaps more desirably, the uncertainties and oversights of my discussion will encourage others to begin more intensive research into this interesting area of study.

APPENDIX

Who Was Sarvajña-Jagatguru?

Who was this ancient ancestor of Rūpa Gosvāmin's named Sarvajña-jagatguru? I have a suggestion that is somewhat speculative, but that may provide an insight into the background of Rūpa's family that has not been reached before. One unusual element of Rūpa's writings is how deeply impressed Rūpa was by the *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* of Simhabhūpāla, a work that is not often quoted in discussions of literary criticism. This may have been because there was a relationship between Rūpa's family and the court of Simhabhūpāla, who ruled in western Andhra in the last part of the 14th century. To be more specific, some evidence suggests that Simhabhūpāla's court poet, Viśveśvara Kavicandra, author of the *Camatkāra-candrikā* and perhaps also, as some have claimed, of the *Rasārṇava-sudhākara*, was a direct ancestor of Rūpa's.⁷²

The evidence is based in part on the family genealogy included at the end of Jiva Gosvāmin's *Laghu-vaiṣṇava-toṣaṇī*. The earliest ancestor mentioned in that account is someone called Sarvajña-jagatguru, who is described as a king of Karṇāṭa. Here is the verse:

Sarvajña-jagatguru, who was the chief of the Bharadvājas on earth, ruled as a king in the land of Karṇāṭa, his feet frequented by an assembly of kings. His tongue, flowing with nectar, a shelter for arrangements of words of surpassing charm, danced repeatedly, like a bee, around the wish-fulfilling vine of the Three (Vedas).⁷³

Most interpreters have taken Sarvajña-jagatguru as the name of Rūpa's ancestor. It is an extremely odd name when compared with the other names in the genealogy (Aniruddha, Rūpeśvara, Harihara, etc.), however. My suggestion is that this is not really his name, but an honorific and descriptive title. Rūpa's ancestor, whose name had reached a state of extraordinary respect and therefore was not given in the verse, is being described as a teacher of the world (*jagat*) and of someone called Sarvajña. As it turns out, one of the names by which Simhabhūpāla was famous throughout South India was Sarvajña.⁷⁴ It also may have been that Jiva did not remember the actual name of his seventh ancestor, a lapse which often occurs in *brāhmaṇa* families who, for ritual purposes, remember back only seven generations, but who also get more and more sketchy about the ancestors

who are furthest removed. Rūpa's ancestors seem to have faced a great deal of misfortune in their migration from the south to Bengal and this might have contributed to a weakening of family traditions by Jīva's time. {?

The other epithets in Jīva's verse suggest that Rūpa's ancestor was a poet who excelled at composition and whose words were sweet to the ear. Viśveśvara was a prolific poet who composed at least nine works, almost all of which are now lost.⁷⁵ In addition, Jīva refers to his ancestor as a leading member of the Bhāradvāja *gotra* (clan) of the *brāhmaṇa* community, which again fits the description of Viśveśvara. One of Viśveśvara's students, Nāga-nātha, described him as "the full ocean of the best of the Bhāradvāja clan."⁷⁶ A verse from another work attributed to Viśveśvara supports this:

The poet of the Bhāradvājas, whose fame is awakening throughout the world (*jagat*), is a connoisseur (*rasika*) with an eagerness for using the essence of the *rasas*. The greatness of the composition of these words of his turns into tremendous joy in the matter of enrapturing the hearts of connoisseurs.⁷⁷

Viśveśvara himself calls Simhabhūpāla by the name Sarvajña in an illustrative verse from the *Camatkāra-candrikā*:

"O deity of learning! Dear one! Teacher! Crown jewel of the knowers of everything (*sarvajña-cūḍāmaṇi*)! You are to be praised," or "you are venerable to the wise, what more can be said." In this way, even an elder, being pleased, speaks to Simhamahīpati, who makes accurate determinations on the essence of various paths and duties.⁷⁸

Viśveśvara sometimes refers to Simhabhūpāla as *kumāra*, which often translates as "prince," and it is, therefore, likely that Viśveśvara's patronage began with Simhabhūpāla's father, Anapota, and that he continued as a court poet after the prince became king.⁷⁹ Viśveśvara was probably Simhabhūpāla's teacher in poetics and dramaturgy, making *sarvajña-guru* a fitting title for him. Anapota's last inscription is dated 1381, indicating that Simhabhūpāla came into power not too long after that. Thus, it seems that Viśveśvara was born around 1350 or slightly earlier and lived until the beginning of the 15th century. This would place him at just about the right period if he were six generations removed from Rūpa (approximately 1470) and seven from Jīva (approximately 1515), if we allow roughly twenty years for each generation.

There are major problems with this suggestion, however. The first stems from the lack of reference to or citation of Viśveśvara in Rūpa's works. It is possible, though, that Viśveśvara was the source of the emphasis on *camatkāra*, "astonishment," as part of the *rasa* experience, that one finds in Rūpa's works.⁸⁰ The emphasis on *camatkāra* could have come from Viśva-nātha's *Sāhitya-darpaṇa* as well, however.⁸¹ Secondly, and perhaps more importantly, Jīva described his ancestor as a king of Karpāta while Viśveśvara lived at the court of Simhabhūpāla. He ruled in Andhra with his capital city in Rājācala, which has been identified as modern-day Rachakonda in the Nalgonda district in Andhra Pradesh by Venkatacharya.⁸² That area is usually referred to as Telaṅga, or Tailaṅga in Sanskrit, rather than Karpāta. Tailaṅga, however, can refer to both Telaṅga and Karpāta according to Apte.⁸³ Since that area, roughly forty miles from Hyderabad, is an area that shares both Karnatic and Andhra cultural influences, this may not be a serious problem. SJSW
Hy
etc.

There is evidence from several sources indicating that Rūpa and his brother, Sanātana, retained strong connections with the community of *brāhmaṇas* from their ancestral homeland and even encouraged the establishment of a community of such *brāhmaṇas* near the capital city of Bengal, Gauḍa, when they were in the service of the Nawāb Husein Shāh.⁸⁴ There are also indications that the brothers used to study the *Bhāgavata Purāna* with some of these *brāhmaṇas*, and it may well be that they studied other texts with them, too.⁸⁵ Consequently, Rūpa may have been exposed to the work of Simhabhūpāla (and Viśveśvara) either through the transmission of his own ancestral traditions and teachings or through the community of "Bhāṭṭas" that they helped settle in Bengal.⁸⁶

ENDNOTES

¹Rūpa begins his two major theoretical works, the *Bhakti-rasāmṛta-sindhu* and the *Ujjvala-nīlamanī*, with verses in praise of Kṛṣṇa, but which, by double entendre, can be interpreted as praises of his brother Sanātana.

²Jīva Gosvāmin, *Laghu-vaiṣṇava-toṣaṇi*, included in the *Śrīmad-bhāgavatam* edited by Nityasvarūpa Brahmācārī with ten commentaries (Calcutta: Gaṇeśa-candra Bhāṭṭācārya, G. 425), Uttarāraha, 3:2101-2. This is partially quoted in the *Bhakti-ratnākara* (Kalikātā: Gauḍīya Mission, 1960) at 1.569-577, pp. 26-28, and fully in *Vṛndāvanera Chaya Gosvāmi* by Nareśacandra Jānā (Calcutta: Kali- ✓

kātā Viśvavidyālaya, 1970), pp. 11-13.

³Nareśacandra Jānā, op. cit., p. 17.

⁴Ibid. Danujamardana also has been identified with the king of Bengal named Gaṇeśa who ruled for a period in the fifteenth century between the Muslim rulers. See Sukhamaya Mukhopādhyāya, *Bāmlāra Itihāsera Duśo Vachara: Svādhi-na Sulatānera Āmala* (Kalikātā: Bhārati Book Stall, 1962), 2:1-58.

⁵Narahari Cakravartin, *Bhakti-ratnākara* (Calcutta: Gauḍīya Mission, 1960), 1.561-566, p. 25.

⁶Jānā, op. cit., p. 20.

⁷Ibid., pp. 20-21.

⁸There is disagreement over when this play was written. The colophon according to De's reading is clearly 1495. The work also lacks any reference to or praise of Caitanya which tends to support the idea that it was written before Rūpa met him. Other readings and interpretations give the dates: 1509, 1529 and 1549. Jānā accepts 1549 as the most likely date of its completion ignoring the lack of reference to Caitanya in the work. See Jānā, op. cit., pp. 117-20.

⁹Sukhamaya Mukhopādhyāya, *Madhyayugera Bāmlā Sāhityera Tathya o Kālakrama* (Kalikātā: G. Bhāradvāja and Co., 1974), p. 59. He gives no justification for supposing that Rūpa had to be thirty when he met Caitanya.

¹⁰*bhaṅgācāryaṁ sāvabhauṁam vidyāvācaspatīn gurūn vande vidyābhūṣaṇām ca gauḍa-deśa-vibhūṣaṇam vande śrīparamānanda-bhaṅgācāryaṁ rasa-priyaṁ rāmahadram tathā vāṇi-vilāsaṁ copadeśakam* (1.5-6)

¹¹Jānā, op. cit., p. 24.

¹²Gaurinātha Śāstrī, in the preface to his edition of Paramānanda's commentary on the *Kāvya-prakāśa*, agrees with Dineśacandra Bhaṅgācārya's identification of Paramānanda Bhaṅgācārya with Paramānanda Cakravartin (Vārāṇasi: Sampūrṇānanda Saṁskṛta Viśvavidyālaya, 1976), p. 3.

¹³Ibid., p. 4.

¹⁴Narahari Cakravartin, 2.474, p. 61.

¹⁵Narahari Cakravartin, 1.590, p. 28. Jānā cites a passage from Sanātana's commentary on his own *Bṛhad-bhāgavatāmṛta* as evidence of his knowledge of Nyāya, p. 22.

¹⁶Ibid., 1.592-94, pp. 28-29.

¹⁷The *Bhakti-ratnākara* cites an example of this. After Sanātana met with Caitanya at Rāmakeli he began to avoid going to work and instead stayed at home and studied the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* with twenty or thirty of these *brāhmaṇas* (Br, 1.653-655, p. 31). See also Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja, *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* (Kalikātā, India: Devakinandana Dharma-prakāśa Kāryālaya, 1337 [1931]), 2.19.15-16, p. 755.

¹⁸Narahari Cakravartin, 1.580-83, p. 28.

¹⁹Dimock suggests, on the basis of a passage of the *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* describing Sanātana's escape from prison and journey to meet Caitanya in Vārāṇasi in the dress of a Dervish, that he may have actually adopted that faith.

²⁰Jānā, pp. 32-33.

²¹Such as in the *Caitanya-bhāgavata* (Kalikātā: Sādhanā Prakāśinī, 1966-1967), 1.1.151-2, 1.9.192, 3.10.263. See Jānā, p. 37.

²²See the lengthy discussion of this question given by Jānā, pp. 27-39. As for Sanātana and Rūpa's statements about themselves see Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja, *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* (Kalikātā. Sādhanā Prakāśinī, n.d.), 2.1.179 and 2.1.186, v. 2, pt. 1:33-35.

²³Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja, 2.1.196-7, v. 2. pt. 1:38.

²⁴Jānā, p. 65. This idea originated with Biman Bihari Majumdar who discusses it in his *Soḍaśa Śatakera Padāvalī*, p. 118.

²⁵Mukhopādhyāya, pp. 125-131. This supposition is based on the idea that all

of the early texts say that Śrīnivāsa arrived just after the deaths of Sanātana and Rūpa, or, more specifically, that they died while he was en route to Vṛndāvana. These texts say the same thing about Śrīnivāsa's attempt to see Caitanya, who died in 1533 in Puri. It is somewhat hard to believe that having missed Caitanya in Puri he would have waited twenty-five years to travel to see Rūpa and Sanātana in Vṛndāvana.

²⁶Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja, 2.19.12-13, v. 2, pt. 2:755. At 2.19.27-8, p. 757, the king asks Sanātana to accompany him on incursion into Orissa.

²⁷Jānā, Appendix C ('ga'), pp. 295-98. Sukhamaya Mukhopādhyāya questions the validity of these documents in spite of their being accepted by the Mathurā courts. To him they bear the characteristics of later forgeries. See his *Madhyayugera Bāmlā Sāhityera Tathya o Kālakrama*, op. cit., pp. 343-5.

²⁸Growse tells us that the Sanskrit inscription inside the temple was too badly damaged in his days to read anything more than the names of Rūpa and Sanātana and the date 1590. Several efforts were made to reconstruct the text of the dedication, but none have succeeded. Recently, however, a manuscript (4694E-6354) has surfaced at the Vrindaban Research Institute called the *Govinda-man-dīrāṣṭaka* that appears to be a copy of the original verses. From this manuscript it is known that Jīva was the author of the verses and the date has been confirmed as 1590. See Asima Kumāra Rāya, *Vṛndāvana Theke Jayapura* (Kalakātā: Jijñāsā, 1985), pp. 86-87.

²⁹This dimension of the construction of the Govinda temple was pointed out to me by one of the leading members of the Gosvāmin society in Vraja today, Shrivatsa Goswami, who argues convincingly not only that the temple represents in three dimensions the entire theology of the Caitanya tradition as developed in Vṛndāvana, but also that a dialogue between the Vaiṣṇava community there and the ruling Muslim society is represented in its architectural design.

³⁰Jīva Gosvāmin, *Tattva-sandarbhā*, ed. Sitanatha Goswami (Calcutta: Jadavpura University, 1967), verses 4-5, pp. 4-5.

³¹*Bhakti-ratnākara*, 1.638, p. 30.

³²Jānā, p. 150.

³³*Bhakti-ratnākara*, 1.639, p. 30.

³⁴*Ibid.*, 1.759-772, pp. 34-35.

³⁵*Ibid.*, 1.684-781, pp. 32-35.

³⁶Jānā, pp. 150-1. I have not been able to find a reference to Jīva's correcting the *Bhakti-rasāmṛta-sindhu* in the *Bhakti-ratnākara*. It does say that Sanātana asked him to correct his *Vaiṣṇava-toṣaṇi* (1554), the result of which is the *Laghu-vaiṣṇava-toṣaṇi* (*Bhakti-ratnākara*, 1.792-3, p. 36).

³⁷Jānā, p. 295.

³⁸Tarapada Mukherjee and J.C. Wright, "An Early Testamentary Document in Sanskrit." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies (BSOAS)*, vol. LXII, 1979, pp. 297-320.

³⁹An early date of 1496, suggested by Satīśacandra Rāya in his introduction to the *Pada-kalpa-taru*, is too unlikely to even consider. Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja would have been 120 years old by the time he finished the *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* (1615 A.D.). D.C. Sen, *Bengali Language and Literature* (Calcutta: University of Calcutta, 1911), p. 477. Rādhāgovinda Nātha, *Śrī Śrī Caitanya-caritāmṛtera Bhūmikā* (4th edition, Kalikātā: Śrī Yatintra Vimala Caudhuri, 1958 ?), p. 2.

⁴⁰Sukhamaya Mukhopādhyāya argues that Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja actually did see Nityānanda personally. He bases this on the wealth of detail that Kṛṣṇadāsa gives in describing how Nityānanda appeared to him in a dream (*Cc*, 1.5. 159-175, pp. 468-469). Not only, he says, did he see Nityānanda, but he must have seen him at an age capable of recording his impressions. He therefore insists that Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja could not have been born later than 1525. (*Madhyayugera Bāmlā Sāhityera Tathya o Kālakrama*, pp. 201-202)

⁴¹Śrī Śrī *Caitanya-caritāmṛtera Bhūmikā*, op. cit., p. 1. Sukhamaya Mukhopādhyāya doubts this account of Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja's background though he does not give any reason except that this information is untraceable to any authoritative source.

⁴²*Caitanya-caritāmṛta*, 1.5.139-175.

⁴³Ravindranātha Maiti, *Caitanya-parikara* (Kalikātā: Bookland Private Limited, n.d.), p. 463, footnote 1.

⁴⁴B.B. Majumdar in his *Śrī-Caitanya-caritera Upādāna* (Kalikātā: Kalikātā Viśvavidyalaya, 1959) puts Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja's arrival in Vṛndāvana at 1557; see p. 296.

⁴⁵Ibid., p. 297.

⁴⁶*Madhyayugera Bāmlā Sāhityera Tathya o Kālakrama*, pp. 203-204, citing *Caitanya-caritāmṛta*, 1.5.179-181.

⁴⁷The *Ujjvala-nīlamanī* is itself quoted in Sanātana's *Vaiṣṇava-toṣaṇī* which is dated 1554 making the *Ujjvala-nīlamanī* a few years younger than the *Vaiṣṇava-toṣaṇī*.

⁴⁸*Caitanya-caritāmṛtera Bhūmikā*, p. 5. A complete version of this succession is published in a modern text called *Bhakta-mālikā o Bhakti-candrikā* by Śrī Haridāsa Cakravartī, pp. i-ii. This succession is called there a "teaching succession" and not an "initiation succession." But this may be with reference to the author of this modern text and not Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja. (Fourth edition. Navadvīpa: Śrī Prabhāvatī Devī, 1391)

⁴⁹*Caitanya-parikara*, pp. 465-468.

⁵⁰Raghunāthadāsa, *Muktā-carita* (Vṛndāvana?: Nityasvarūpa Brahmācārī, n.d.), p. 242.

⁵¹Narahari Cakravartin, *Narottama-vilāsa* (Baharampura: Rāmadeva Miśra, n.d.), p. 204.

⁵²Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja also says that when he went to Vṛndāvana he obtained the shelter of Svarūpa Dāmodara (Cc, 1.5.180). Sukhamaya Mukhopādhyāya argues that Svarūpa Dāmodara retired to Vṛndāvana after Caitanya died in Purī and that Raghunāthadāsa stayed in Purī. When Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja arrived in Vṛndāvana, he found Sanātana, Rūpa, and Svarūpa there. After Svarūpa's death, Raghunāthadāsa came to Vṛndāvana from Purī. (*Madhyayugera Bāmlā Sāhityera Tathya o Kālakrama*, pp. 202-204)

⁵³Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja himself tells the story of this request in the *Caitanya-*

caritāmṛta, 1.8.45-80, pp. 601-605.

⁵⁴Excluding, of course, the Purāṇic accounts of the story of Kṛṣṇa. *Caitanya-cariter Upādāna*, p. 293.

⁵⁵Rādhākṛṣṇadāsa Gosvāmin, *Daśa-Śloki-bhāṣya* (Vṛndāvana: Śrī Haridāsa Śāstrī, 1982), pp. 8-10.

⁵⁶*Caitanya-cariter Upādāna*, p. 293.

⁵⁷*Muktā-carita*, p. 242.

⁵⁸*Caitanya-caritāmṛta*, 3.20.83-85, p. 762.

⁵⁹Jagadbandhu Bhadra, *Gaurāṅga-pada-taraṅgini* (Kalikātā: Baṅgiya Sāhitya Pa-riṣat, 1341), intro., p. 81.

⁶⁰Quoted in *Caitanya-cariter Upādāna*, p. 310.

⁶¹Ibid., p. 314.

⁶²Sukhamaya Mukhopādhyāya argues that the date of this ill-fated, but ultimately successful, transportation of the Gosvāmin books took place in 1566-7. On the basis of one of Śrīnivāsa's disciples' accounts, he says that the stealing of the books did not take place on the journey from Vṛndāvana to Bengal but on a subsequent journey between Bengal and Purī about 1570-72. Thus the books made it safely to Bengal and were copied there but the originals or some copies were stolen during their transport to Orissa. There is a problem reconciling this chronology with the dates of Vira Hamvira, who is usually dated between 1585-1614. Envisioning him on the throne between 1570 and 1614 is a bit difficult in spite of Mukhopādhyāya's assurances. (*Madhyayugera Bāmlā Sāhityera Tathya o Kālakrama*, pp. 114-120)

⁶³*Caitanya-cariter Upādāna*, p. 309.

⁶⁴BSOAS, vol. LXII, op. cit., pp. 297-320.

⁶⁵*Caitanya-caritāmṛta*, 1.8.50-67, pp. 602-604.

- 66 Told in the *Prema-vilāsa*.
- 67 The manuscript named *Kavirāja Gosvāmīra Śākhānirṇaya* is number 166 in the Pāṭhabāḍī library.
- 68 Included in Haridāsa Dāsa's edition of the *Ujjvala-nīlamanī*. (Navadvīpa: Haribol Kuṭīra, 469 G.)
- 69 *Svātma-pramodini*, p. 366.
- 70 *Ibid.*, verse 5, p. 1.
- 71 Possibly the work was published as volume 21 in the *Saṁskṛta-sāhitya-parīṣat-granthāvalī*.
- 72 See Pandiri Sarasvatī Mohan's introduction to her edition of the *Camatkāra-candrikā* (Delhi: Meharchand Lachhmandas, 1972), p. 21, for an opinion in favor of Viśveśvara's authorship of the *Rasārṇava-sudhākara*. See Venkatacharya's discussion of the problem in his edition of the *Rasārṇava-sudhākara*, p. liv-lv.
- 73 Jīva Gosvāmin, *Laghu-vaiṣṇava-toṣaṇī* (Kalikātā: Gaṇeśacandra Bhaṭṭācārya, 425 [1911]), pp. 2101-2102.
- 74 See S.K. De, *History of Sanskrit Poetics*, 2 vols. in 1 (Calcutta: Firma KLM Private, Ltd., 1976), 1:240 and P.S. Mohan's introduction to her edition of *Camatkāra-candrikā*, op. cit., p. 14. See also Sriramamurti's introduction to his edition of the same text (Waltair, India: Andhra University, 1969), p. xxv. He mentions that Śirṅhabhūpāla's chief rival, the Reddī king Pedakomaṭivema, also assumed the title Sarvajña.
- 75 See Mohan for a list of possible works by Viśveśvara. (p. 20)
- 76 Viśveśvara Kavīcandra, *The Camatkāracandrikā of Śrī Viśveśvara Kavīcandra: Critical Edition and Study*, ed., P.S. Mohan, intro., pp. 18-19.
- 77 This verse is from a work called the *Karuṇā-kandala* quoted in the *Rasārṇava-sudhākara*. It is cited on pp. 20-21 and 28 in Mohan's introduction to the *Camatkāra-candrikā*.
- 78 Viśveśvara, *Camatkāra-candrikā* (Mohan's edition), p. 93

- 79 See Mohan's introduction, pp. 21-22.
- 80 See Rūpa's *Bhakti-rasāmṛta-sindhu* at 2.5.81, 2.5.104, 2.5.110, and 5.2.132. Viśveśvara's *Camatkāra-candrikā* makes astonishment (*camatkāra*) the major element in fine poetry (1.6).
- 81 Viśvanātha refers to the view of his great great grandfather named Nārāyaṇa who taught that astonishment is the essence of *rasa* in the *Sāhitya-darpaṇa*, Chapter Three, p. 86.
- 82 See the introduction to T. Venkatacharya's edition of the *Rasārṇava-sudhākara*, pp. xliii-xliv.
- 83 Apte, *The Practical Sanskrit English Dictionary*, revised and enlarged edition (Poona: Prasad Prakashan, 1979), 2:786.
- 84 Narahari Cakravartin, *Bhakti-ratnākara*, op. cit., 1.592-595, pp. 28-29.
- 85 *Ibid.*, 1.653-655, p. 31.
- 86 "Bhaṭṭa" is a word used in the *Bhakti-ratnākara* to refer to this *brāhmaṇa* community that Sanātana and Rūpa frequented. This could be an indication that the community was from Tailaṅga rather than Karnāṭa, since there were a number of well known Bhaṭṭas who came from there. Vallabha Bhaṭṭa, also known as Vallabhācārya, the founder of an important tradition of the Vaiṣṇava faith, is one excellent example. Sanātana and Rūpa, according to the traditions of Braj, were close to Vallabha's family, especially to his son, Viṭṭhaleśa, whose house in Mathurā they occasionally visited. This might be another expression of their desire to keep up ties with their roots in South India.